REMARKS

No claims have been amended, canceled or added. Applicant respectfully requests further examination of the application in view of the following.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by *Wang et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0165719). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The claimed invention integrates a speech interface with a graphical user interface that visually, i.e., graphically, prompts the user for spoken input at appropriate points in a user-computer information-entry dialog. Independent claims 1, 8 and 15, from which the remaining claims in this rejection depend, all plainly recite that the graphical user interface "prompts the user for expected inputs that the user can speak at designated points in a dialog according to a specified grammar." The Examiner points to paragraph 0010, lines 3-7 and paragraph 0008, lines 7-9 of *Wang et al.* as disclosing such a feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees that this is what *Wang et al.* discloses.

Wang et al. discloses a system that allows a user to input information in spoken form into what is otherwise a graphical user interface of a device such as a handheld computing device or a networked client computer. It includes a voice-recognition feature that interprets the speech and returns data to the device that is responsive to the recognized speech. However, it does not appear to **prompt** the user at points in a **dialog** for the expected inputs according to a specified **grammar**. The section of *Wang et al.* cited by the Examiner provides an overview of one aspect of the disclosure in the Summary of the Invention section:

> As a second aspect of the present invention, a markup language for execution on a client device in a client/server system includes instructions to unify at least one of recognition-related events, GUI events and telephony events on a non-display, voice input based client device and a multimodal based client for a web server interacting with each of the client devices.

Wang et al., paragraph 0010.

While this paragraph may at first blush seem to vaguely describe something relevant to the claimed invention, a careful read of the Detailed Description section that follows it reveals that there appears to be no feature in <u>Wang</u> that <u>prompts</u> a user to speak information into the system in accordance with a specified grammar, nor does there appear to be an information-entry <u>dialog</u> between the user and computer. The Examiner also cites Figure 1 of *Wang et al.* as disclosing prompts, but the text-entry box labels, such as "Subject," "Location", "Attendees," etc., are merely labels that indicate what kind of information is to be entered into the box, not prompts that are generated according to a specified grammar at particular points in a dialog that aid the user in knowing what to speak at that particular point in the dialog so that it will be recognized.

Voice input as a means for entering information into a computer system is not new. What is new is Applicant's system and method for addressing the problem that, with voice input, a user does not always know what is the acceptable lexicon (dictionary) and grammar at each particular point in a dialog. For example, in interacting with a voice-input system for making airline reservations, a user may arrive at a point in the dialog at which it is unclear to the user whether to say, "Book a flight" or "Book a seat."

Furthermore, Applicant does not believe that the various text labels on the input boxes shown in Figure 1 of *Wang et al.* would even be considered by one skilled in the art to constitute a "dialog" within the broadest reasonable interpretation of that term. One typical definition of a dialog is: "a conversation between two or more persons; *also*: a similar exchange between a person and something else (as a computer)." *www.Merriam-Webster.com*. Figure 1 of *Wang et al.* shows a screen display with a simply array of text-entry boxes, where the labels themselves indicate what is to be entered but offer the user no clue as to whether the spoken entry must conform to some predetermined or specified dictionary or grammar in order to be recognized. There is no "conversation" or "exchange" aspect to a simple array of text-entry boxes. A conversation or exchange—a dialog—implies some sort of sequence over time, with the user and computer each proceeding in response to the previous communication from the other. An automated airline reservations system is an excellent example of a voice-based user interface involving a dialog. Applicant's invention enhances such as user interface by adding a visual, i.e.,

graphical, prompt aspect that clarifies what the user is to say at certain points in the dialog in order to satisfy a grammar on which the voice recognition is based.

Also, while paragraph 0008 of <u>Wang</u> cited by the Examiner mentions that the speech recognition function receives from the client device an indication of the grammar to use in the recognition process, this does not in any way relate to <u>prompting the user for expected inputs that the user can speak at designated points in a dialog according to a specified grammar</u>. As *Wang et al.* does not even disclose anything about prompting the user for spoken input, it is no surprise that *Wang et al.* does not disclose that any such prompt would be in accordance with a specified grammar.

Respectfully directing the Examiner's attention to, for example, paragraphs 0060-0068 of Wang, it appears that *Wang et al.* is referring to using the graphical input mechanism itself to select in which one of the text-entry boxes (e.g., Figs. 1 and 6) the speech is to relate. In other words, it appears for example that a pointing device would first be used to indicate the graphical field or box, and then the user would speak into the microphone. The system would perform speech recognition in accordance with some predetermined grammar and return results to the device that the device would use to fill in the fields or boxes. Speech recognition may aid the filling-in of such fields or boxes, but it does not appear that there are any prompts, as part of a dialog or sequence, that specify just what ("wherein prompts may specify words that are recognized by the system" and "wherein prompts may specify the type of expected input") the user can speak at designated points in that dialog so that the system can recognize the speech ("according to a specified grammar").

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that *Wang et al.* does not anticipate claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-18 and 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang et al.* in view of *Katsuranis* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021336). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires, among other things, that all limitations recited in a claim be shown to be present in the prior art. The Examiner does not cite *Katsuranis*

as disclosing the limitations discussed above with regard to claims 1, 8 and 15 and claims that depend therefrom. As claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19 and 21 also depend from claims 1, 8 and 15, they too include limitations that have not been shown to be present in the prior art. Thus, based upon the discussion above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot stand, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection as well.

Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19 and 21 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang et al.* in view of *Katsuranis* and further in view of *Dantzig* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0071833). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the same reasons as in the above rejection of these same claims as unpatentable over *Wang et al.* in view of *Katsuranis* alone. That is, as a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that all limitations recited in a claim be shown to be present in the prior art, and as the Examiner does not cite either *Katsuranis* or *Dantzig* as disclosing the limitations discussed above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot stand. Applicant therefore similarly respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing response places the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Bobby Slaton at (972) 477-1497.

Respectfully submitted,

GARDNER GROFF GREENWALD & VILLANUEVA, P.C.

Dated: August 30, 2007   /Arthur A. Gardner/

Lawrence D. Maxwell, Reg. No. 33,887

Customer Number 24587

GARDNER GROFF GREENWALD & VILLANUEVA, P.C.
tel: 770.984.2300
fax: 770.984.0098